

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 9 and 14 have been amended by this paper.

Claims 1-5, 7, 14-16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,986,510 to Bellamy et al. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Bellamy et al. reference discloses a hydraulic antivibratory device including a valve 8 mounted between two flat and parallel perforated grids or plates 9, 10. As shown in Fig. 2, the valve 8 has the form of a biconvex lens, wherein each face of the valve 8 bulges out with a continuous curvature. (Col. 2, ll. 52-55.)

In contrast, the pending claims of the present application, as amended by this paper, require an enlarged central node extending outward from a central portion of the diaphragm. The Bellamy et al. reference does not disclose a diaphragm having a node, let alone a node extending outward from a central portion of the diaphragm.

Accordingly, inasmuch as the Bellamy et al. reference fails to teach an enlarged central node extending outward from a central portion of the diaphragm, it is submitted that the Bellamy et al. reference fails to teach each and every limitation of the pending claims of the present application and therefore cannot, as a matter of law, anticipate the pending claims of the present application. Withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-5, 7, 14-16 and 18 under § 102(b) in view of the Bellamy et al. reference is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,505,822 to Yamamoto et al. The rejections are respectfully traversed.

As previously argued, claims 1-3 and 7 require that the periphery of the diaphragm is “spaced apart from at least one of the upper or lower orifice plates.” The Yamamoto et al. references does not teach such a structure and, therefore, cannot, as a matter of law, anticipate claims 1-3 and 7 of the present application. Withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-3 and 7 under § 102(e) is respectfully requested.

Claims 6, 8-13 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Bellamy et al. reference in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,104,100 to Simuttis. The rejections are respectfully traversed.


U.S. Ser. No. 10/092,320
Docket No. DP-306837
Amendment After Final

The Simuttis reference discloses a rubber mount with hydraulic damping including a partition 3, as shown in Fig. 1. However, like the Bellamy et al. reference, the Simuttis reference fails to teach an enlarged central node extending outward from a central portion of the diaphragm. Therefore, the combination of the Bellamy et al. and Simuttis references cannot, as a matter of law, render claims 6, 8-13 and 17 obvious. Withdrawal of the rejections of claims 6, 8-13 and 17 under § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the claims of the present application are in condition for allowance and formal notice thereof is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to treat any paper that is filed in this application, which requires an extension of time, as incorporating a request for such an extension. (37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).) The Commissioner is further authorized to charge any fees required by this paper or to credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-0809.

Respectfully submitted,



Victor J. Wasylyna
Reg. No. 52,345

THOMPSON HINE LLP
Post Office Box 8801
Dayton, Ohio 45401-8801
Phone: (937) 443-6812
E-mail: IPGroup@ThompsonHine.com

511166